

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE APPLICATION OF OLDHAM COUNTY)	
WATER DISTRICT NO. 1 TO DEVIATE FROM)	CASE NO.
CERTAIN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION)	90-228
RULES AND REGULATIONS)	

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that Oldham County Water District No. 1 ("Oldham No. 1") shall file the original and 12 copies of the following information with the Commission no later than June 10, 1991, with a copy to all parties of record. If the information requested is in the possession of the Louisville Water Company ("LWC"), Oldham No. 1 shall obtain it from same. Oldham No. 1 shall furnish with each response the name of the witness who will be available for responding to questions concerning each item of information should a public hearing be required in this matter.

1. Reference is made to Item 30 of the Commission's Order of October 5, 1990. Describe specifically LWC's procedure for monitoring water pressure throughout Oldham County's service area. Please refer to Commission regulation 807 KAR 5:066, Section 6(3), in describing the procedures and the time intervals for monitoring pressure. Provide documentation of the pressure monitoring done throughout Oldham No. 1's service area for the last two calendar years.

2. What is the lot size of the meters still in service which were purchased by LWC each year from 1970 through 1990?

3. To what use does Oldham No. 1 apply the \$50 not refunded to real estate developers for extension tap-ons?

4. On page 4 of the document filed into the record by Oldham No. 1 on January 3, 1991 entitled "Random Statistical Sample Testing," it is stated that LWC meters are tested at the following test flows: minimum - 1/4 GPM for two gallons; intermediate - 2 GPM for 10 gallons; and maximum - 15 GPM for 50 gallons. Explain why the minimum flow of 1/4 GPM for two gallons and maximum flow of 15 GPM for 50 gallons does not comply with AWWA M6 Standards.

5. Item 5 of the Commission's Order of October 5, 1990 requested the total revenue collected from tap fees in each of the last three years, how much was retained by LWC and how much by Oldham No. 1. Oldham No. 1 provided the number of customers and the tap fee amount, but not the revenue.

a. Provide the revenue amounts as requested.

b. What was the total dollar amount refunded to developers in each of the three years?

c. Were refunds made to persons other than developers? If so, provide details as to whom and how much was refunded during the three-year period.

6. In response to Item 13 of the Commission's October 5, 1990 Order, Oldham No. 1 stated the Commissioners meet at least monthly, not scheduled, and usually two or three times a month at the call of the Chairman; however, the response to Item 14

(Exhibit F) documents six meetings from September 26, 1989 to November 16, 1990, a period of 15 months. Reconcile Exhibit F to Response No. 13.

7. With reference to Items 23 and 24 of the Commission's October 5, 1990 Order:

a. Did the developer advance the total cost of construction for each project?

b. What total dollar amount has been refunded to the developer for each project?

c. What total dollar amount has been retained by Oldham No. 1 for each project?

8. The response to Item 6 of the Commission's October 5, 1990 Order states that when the system first began, subscribers paid tap fees ranging from \$50 to \$300. Did LWC charge a tap fee in addition to this?

a. If the answer is no, at what point did LWC and Oldham No. 1 begin charging the two separate tap fees?

b. If the answer is yes, what was the amount of the tap fee charged by LWC to the initial subscribers?

9. Page 40 of Oldham No. 1's tariff provides a schedule of tap fees which became effective in December 1969. Have these tap fee levels ever been charged? If yes, provide details. If no, explain why not.

10. Has Oldham No. 1 incurred indebtedness other than the original \$875,000 of water revenue bonds? If so, explain.

11. The minutes of the October 2, 1990 meeting mention the possibility of impact fees (figures) to be charged developers.

a. Have any impact fees been charged?

b. If so, provide a detailed list showing the amounts of each impact fee charged, the person charged, and an explanation of the reason for and method of calculating the charge.

c. Does Oldham No. 1 envision that such impact fee would be assessed against developers only or would individual applicants also pay this type fee?

d. If an impact fee were assessed, would the revenue be retained by Oldham No. 1 or LWC?

e. For what purpose would revenue from such fee be used?

f. Has Oldham No. 1 requested or does it intend to request Commission approval of an impact fee?

12. Section 3.04 of Oldham No. 1's tariff does not specify that it applies only when the applicant for the extension is a developer of a subdivision, as opposed to an individual applicant. Does Oldham No. 1 intend that this section apply only to developers of subdivisions?

13. Sections 3.02 and 3.04 of LWC's "Service Rules and Regulations" require an applicant for an extension of the utility's main to pay the entire cost of the extension. Does Oldham No. 1 apply these sections to individual applicants, or only to developers of subdivisions?

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 29th day of May, 1991.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


For the Commission

ATTEST:


Executive Director